



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

QUARTERLY JOURNAL  
OF THE  
STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

---

DECEMBER, 1860.

---

ABSTRACTS *and* INFERENCES *founded upon the* OFFICIAL CRIMINAL  
RETURNS *of* ENGLAND *and* WALES *for the Years* 1854-9, *with*  
SPECIAL REFERENCE *to the results of* REFORMATORIES. *By*  
T. BARWICK LLOYD BAKER, Esq., *Hardwicke Court, near*  
*Gloucester.*

[Read before the Statistical Society, 20th November, 1860.]

I CAN only hope that my publishing the accompanying tables as a help to County Magistrates, may not be considered as an impertinence. They pretend to no originality; they are mere copies from some of Mr. Redgrave's "Judicial Statistics," which they by no means attempt to supersede, and they are addressed to County Magistrates, the average of whom are quite as able as myself to understand and appreciate, and comment upon the original. But to go even moderately into Mr. Redgrave's returns, requires a good deal of time and thought; and, therefore, if there be certain portions more peculiarly worth the study of county magistrates, it may be worth while to have these presented in such a form that a moment's reference may show how each county stands in certain points as compared with others.

It appears to me that there are such points demanding peculiar attention from all County Magistrates, and therefore, requiring to be published in such a form as may make a reference to them as easy as possible. Now a clever man of studious habits, who can work at a large blue book till he knows exactly where to turn for the table he wants, is apt to believe all the rest of the world as clever and studious as himself. But I know full well that there are many who, if less dull than myself, are usually as fully occupied, and these might be glad of a small book which would enable them to compare their own counties with others.

I believe that a moderate study of statistics would be of the utmost value to County Magistrates, and also that there are few classes of men who could give such valuable assistance to the Statist of Crime. Mr. Redgrave—the loss of whose services in this department will be greatly regretted by all who have read his books or known himself—once said to me “The figures in which I deal are most “valuable if taken at their proper worth; but they are never the “whole of truth; they are only the dry bones which make indeed “the frame work, but require to have the muscle and skin added to “give a correct outline.”

Now the occasion which led to this observation I shall advert to in its place, but I am inclined to believe that there are no class of men who could so well supply that “muscle” as the County Magistrates, if their attention were given to it.

The first column of the Table (F) in the Appendix, contains simply an *alphabetical* list of the counties.

Column B gives the acreage taken from the Census of 1851, which together with Column I, shows the density of population, an item of some value in Criminal Statistics, and of very great variation, Cheshire having about 1·73 acres to a man; Durham, 1·59; Stafford, 1·19; Warwick, 1·80; Worcester, 1·70; and West York, 1·39; while East and North York have 4·48 acres to a man; Cumberland, 5·12; Northumberland, 4·11; Hereford, 4·63; Lincoln, 4·36; Rutland, 4·18; and Westmoreland, 8·29.

This calculation indeed will not be perfectly correct, as the population is taken from the police districts, and the acreage from the geographical county, but it will be near enough for ordinary purposes.

The next six columns or Group C (cols. 3—8) give the number of *Indictable Offences* tried in each county from the six years 1854-9 inclusive. It was in talking over these figures that Mr. Redgrave made the observation before alluded to, and these figures taken simply, would certainly give a wrong impression, and require a large amount of knowledge *of facts* to enable any one to judge of them rightly. On the one hand, account must be taken of Lord Palmerston's Criminal Justice Bill, which transferred a large number of offences from the quarter to the petty sessions in 1854, and therefore would apparently reduce the number recorded. On the other hand, we must remember that many cases which would be thought too slight to be sent to quarter sessions, entailing thereby the absence of prosecutors and of witnesses from home and business for several days, would be brought before a petty sessions, where the absence from home would be but of few hours duration.

To this must be added, what I believe most magistrates of twenty

or thirty years' experience will bear me out in stating, the inclination of the present generation to prosecute offences of so slight a nature as, thirty years since, would have been held too trifling to bring before a jury. Do not suppose that I regret or would discountenance this practice. On the contrary, I believe that many a man is thus checked in the commencement of crime, and others prevented from commencing: but in forming any judgment on the present amount of crime, as compared with the past, this fact, if, as I believe, it be one, must be taken into consideration.

The four next columns (Group D, cols. 9—12), giving the *numbers of Commitments of any kind to prison*, gives a far more reliable table, and it is satisfactory to see that the numbers have sunk in four years from 113,736 in 1856, to 107,172 in 1859. This favourable balance is enhanced by the fact that during these four years police have been established in most counties of England. Now the natural tendency of the first establishment of a police force is to decrease crime, but to do it by *increasing detection* and therefore increasing convictions in proportion to the crimes committed. If therefore the commitments to prison be decreased, we may well hope that the actual crimes are reduced in a far greater degree.

The next, Group E, gives the daily average in gaols. This, taken in conjunction with D, gives a fair idea of the average length of imprisonment in each year.

The two next groups of columns (F and G, cols. 17—20, and cols. 21—24), brings us to the number of *Boys and Girls under 16 years of age*, committed in the four years 1856-9, and the *diminution* from 10,634 to 6,704 *boys*, and from 2,108 to 1,185 *girls*, strikes us very forcibly.

To what circumstances this extraordinary decrease may be attributed, must be a matter of opinion. But here again I believe that the decrease of *commitments*, great as it is, falls far short of the decrease in the number of *crimes*. I make no remarks here on the cases of *girls*, as I have no experience in the treatment of them, and I am inclined to believe that they must be dealt with on totally different principles. Their crimes depend far less on gangs or on the corruption or instruction of others, than on their own individual propensities. They must, therefore, be treated individually.

But as to *boys*, so far as I can ascertain from the magistrates and police of different counties and towns, the race of six or ten times convicted boys,—the regular, habitual, skilful thieves, have nearly ceased to exist—excepting in London. Nearly every boy on a second if not a first conviction, is sent to a reformatory, and even if he be not reformed, even if he leave the reformatory with no sounder principle of honesty than that with which he entered it, at the very least he cannot be practising stealing and corrupting others while he is

digging on the farm. When he returns after some years to his home, his gang of old companions is dispersed (for a generation of boy thieves is soon past), and he at the very least must return with stiffened fingers and honest *habits*, even if with unimproved will. Facts happily bear us out in stating that a very large proportion of those who have come to us with the worst habits, do afterwards make useful and honest members of society: but I speak not of the effects we may hope for, but of those which are self-evident.

But if this be true, if a thief can scarcely complete his apprenticeship without his course being arrested, if the attainment of really skilful thieving, and the shelter of gangs of confederates be thus prevented, I think it necessarily follows that the number of crimes is far more decreased than that of convictions. When a clever practised thief, well-backed and assisted by a set of skilful confederates, will steal fifty articles without detection, a young hand with none to help or teach him, will be caught at his fifth essay, even without reckoning for the vigilance of the police, so greatly increased since 1856. If so, a reduction in convictions of about 36 per cent. would represent a reduction of crime to a far greater amount.

But some say, this diminution is not owing to Reformatories, but to a variety of other circumstances; abundance of employment, cheapness of food, increased vigilance of police, and lessening of payment to prosecutors and witnesses, have all tended to a reduction more temporary than real. To this I can only answer that these causes would have influenced Adult at least as much as Juvenile Crime. Yet the *Juvenile Crime* has fallen *steadily* from 13,981 in 1856, to 8,913 in 1859, being a reduction of 5,068, or 36 *per cent.*, while the *Adult Crime* has fallen *unsteadily* from 99,755 to 98,159, or 1½ per cent. only.\* The last reason, too, which is most strongly urged by many, can have but little weight in the cases of juveniles, all of whom may be, and nearly three-fourths of whom are, tried summarily.

The spread of Instruction, too, especially by Ragged Schools, thus giving some humanizing education to the very lowest, is alleged as a cause of the diminution. Highly, however, as I value these schools, I am not inclined to think that they have much hand in the diminution of juvenile crime. I know not what the experience of others may be, but I would earnestly call the attention of those who have an opportunity of examining into the subject, to see whether *three-fourths* or more of the twice or oftener convicted boys are not the children of parents *far above* that class whom a Ragged School could with justice receive.

* Total committals, 1856.....	113,736	Total committals, 1859.....	107,072
Deduct boys and girls .....	13,981	Deduct boys and girls .....	8,913
Adults committed .....	99,755	Adults committed .....	98,159

I certainly have found this to be the case almost universally in Gloucestershire, less so in Bristol, generally in the boys I have received from Birmingham and Liverpool, and I am inclined to believe that I shall find it far more than I had expected in London. Of this I shall probably, ere long, be better able to judge. But at any rate the spread of education has proceeded slowly and steadily for ten years or more, while the sudden diminution of juvenile crime is exactly coeval with the rise of reformatories. Nay, we even find that in two towns so similarly situated as Liverpool and Manchester (save that Manchester possessed a reformatory twelve months *later* than Liverpool), the number of boys convicted in Liverpool in the four years 1856-9, were 708, 502, 387, 404; while in Manchester, they ran 751, 827, 622, 401; each showing a diminution just at the time reformatory action commenced.

However, this is a question influenced by so many causes, that I can only suggest my own opinion, and then leave it open to after discussion.

The next group (H, cols. 26—31), is principally taken from the returns in the Report of the Rev. Sydney Turner for 1859. He has given us the *Numbers of Boys sent to Reformatories* in each of the four years, 1856-9, from each county. At first sight his tables do not appear to show so clear a connection with the reduction of crime as might have been expected. To try it more closely, I have altered the position of some columns and added one or two calculated from them, and I think I am justified in drawing from them a rather curious result.

I have always believed that the real use and value of a Reformatory was not the receiving every boy who happened to yield to some slight temptation, and the keeping him there for *his* benefit at the country's cost; but the receiving just the leaders of crime, with a view not so much to benefit *them*, as to prevent their leading others astray. The magistrates of some counties have taken the same view as myself, and have, as it appears, carefully sought out the worst boys and have sent *those only* to reformatories. In other counties they have taken the plan of receiving any boy who it was thought might be benefitted by this training, and of course have sent a far larger proportion.

Now I have taken the Committals of 1856 (col. 26), as giving a fair guess at the amount of crime *before* reformation began to work. Col. 27 gives the number of *Boys* who have been sent to any reformatory, no matter where, from each county during the four years.

The next (col. 28), gives the proportion which the number of *Juveniles* sent away in the four years bears to the total number of Committals in 1856.

The next (col. 29), gives the convictions of Boys in 1859. Col. 30 the reduction effected in the four years; and col. 31 the

proportion which the reduction bears to the total convictions of Boys in 1856.

Now we must remember that statistics will seldom afford a true deduction when applied to very small numbers. We find, for instance, that the crime of very small counties varies in a way which sets calculation at defiance, while that of a larger number is less the sport of accident.

If then we divide the Counties into groups, placing first those whose numbers sent to Reformatories in the four years are *above 50 per cent.* of the total committals of 1856, we have the following Table (A).

(A).—*Four Years, 1856-9.—Sentences to Reformatories.—Counties sending ABOVE 50 PER CENT. of the Total Committals of 1856.*

1 COUNTIES.	2 Committed in 1856.	3 Percentage sent to Reformatories.	4 Reduction of Crime.
Wilts .....	37	86·4	18·9
Worcester .....	80	77·5	7·5
*Warwick .....	366	63·6	45·6
Beds .....	46	60·8	39·1
*Norfolk .....	187	57·2	37·9
*Northumberland .....	220	56·6	31·8
Berks .....	68	55·8	33·8
<i>Average</i> .....	—	—	30·4

\* The average of (col. 4) the three cases of Warwick, Norfolk, and Northumberland, is 38·1 *per cent.* decrease.

If we take the second group of Counties as those in which the Boys sent to Reformatories number from 40 to 50 per cent. of the committals of 1856, we have thus in Table (B):—

(B.).—*Four Years, 1856-9.—Sentences to Reformatories.—Counties sending ONLY between 40 and 50 PER CENT. of the Total Committals of 1856.*

1 COUNTIES.	2 Committed in 1856.	3 Percentage sent to Reformatories.	4 Reduction of Crime.
Cumberland .....	44	43·1	47·7
*York .....	796	43·	44·3
*Gloucester .....	382	42·6	32·1
Dorset .....	54	42·5	59·2
Westmoreland .....	12	41·6	33·3
<i>Average</i> .....	—	—	43·1

\* The average of the two cases of York and Gloucester, is 38·2 *per cent.* decrease.

The Counties who have sent between 30 and 40 *per cent.* are as in (C):—

(C.)—*Four Years, 1856-9.—Sentences to Reformatories.—Counties sending ONLY between 30 and 40 PER CENT. of the Total Committals of 1856.*

1 COUNTIES.	2 Committed in 1856.	3 Percentage sent to Reformatories.	4 Reduction of Crime.
Lancashire .....	1,737	39 '9	40 '8
Suffolk .....	123	35 '7	39 '8
Cheshire .....	242	35 '1	51 '6
<i>Average</i> .....	—	—	44 '0

The Counties who have sent between 20 and 30 *per cent.* are as in (D):—

(D.)—*Four Years, 1856-9.—Sentences to Reformatories.—Counties sending ONLY between 20 and 30 PER CENT. of the Total Committals of 1856.*

1 COUNTIES.	2 Committed in 1856.	3 Percentage sent to Reformatories.	4 Reduction of Crime.
*Somerset .....	171	26 '3	22 '1
South Wales .....	125	25 '6	19 '0
Derby .....	79	25 '3	50 '6
*Devon .....	202	25 '2	21 '2
*Sussex .....	150	24 '0	28 '6
*Stafford .....	209	22 '4	14 '8
*Hants.....	239	21 '3	35 '5
Oxon .....	44	20 '4	47 '7
*Notts .....	119	20 '1	26 '0
*Essex.....	175	20 '0	50 '8
<i>Average</i> .....	—	—	31 '6

*Note.*—The average of the seven cases marked (\*), is 28'3 *per cent.* decrease.

The Counties who have sent *under 20 per cent.* are as in (E):—



(E.)—*Four Years, 1856-9.—Sentences to Reformatories.—Counties sending UNDER 20 PER CENT. of the Total Committals of 1856.*

1 COUNTIES.	2 Committed in 1856.	3 Percentage sent to Reformatories.	4 Reduction of Crime.
Salop .....	67	19·3	31·3
Herts.....	94	18·	47·8
Northampton.....	79	17·9	15·
Cambridge.....	52	17·3	11·5
Monmouth .....	42	16·6	50·
*Kent .....	285	14·3	17·1
*Middlesex .....	3,606	11·8	36·7
North Wales.....	27	11·1	66·6
Bucks.....	46	10·8	8·6
*Surrey .....	1,317	7·2	46·7
<i>Average</i> .....	—	—	32·7

*Note.*—The average of the three cases marked (\*), is 33·4 per cent. decrease.

If this be correct and trustworthy, it would appear that the Counties in the *first group* have sent very large proportionate numbers, yet only reduced their crime by 30·4 per cent. The *second group*, who have sent fewer, have reduced it by 43 per cent. The *third group* by 44 per cent. The *fourth* by 31·6 per cent., and the *fifth* by 32·7 per cent. But if all the *smaller* counties are thrown out, *i.e.*, those which in 1856 had less than 100 convictions, the results will be a *Decrease of Committals* in 1859 as compared with 1856 as follows, *viz.*:—

Group 1.	Average 38·1 per cent. decrease.		
„ 2.	38·2	„	
„ 3.	44·	„	
„ 4.	28·3	„	
„ 5.	33·4	„	

Appearing to show in a nearly regular proportion that somewhere about the *third group* is the happy medium. If this be true, it is of the more consequence that it should be noticed, as the expense of sending boys to Reformatories, unless it produce an adequate result is objectionable.\*

\* There are besides these, some counties that we may, I think, fairly treat as exceptional cases, hardly coming within any rule.

Durham, for instance, has sent to reformatories a larger proportion of its crime (of 1856) than any other county; yet its crime in 1859 is higher than in 1856. But this is hardly to be wondered at in a county which has in ten years nearly doubled its population, by attracting to its wonderfully increasing mines the least steady hands from other counties. However, Durham shows a steady decrease for the last three years from 213 in 1857 to 137 in 1859.

Leicester, Lincoln, and Hereford too, have increased. The amount of crime is small in each, and very fluctuating.

I dare not, however, pretend to draw a certain conclusion from these premises; I only wish to call attention to the subject, and let the future show whether it be well grounded or no.

The remaining columns of the tables have reference to the police and their returns. Col. I gives the population of their districts; K gives the number of constables, their gross cost, and cost per man (cols. 33, 34, 35); L their return of known thieves; M a table calculated from the last, showing the proportion of known thieves in each county, and N the number of prostitutes.

These columns may all be useful for reference, but it is to L and M that I particularly wish to draw the attention of both magistrates and police.

I believe that the attempts made by Mr. Redgrave to number and classify all the *Habitual Criminals* throughout England, will be, when thoroughly carried out, one of the strongest preventatives to crime that we can possibly have. As burglars are more likely to be *stopped* by a light which they see than by a blunderbuss which they do not, so depend upon it, thieves will be more *stopped* by finding themselves and their proceedings known and registered, than by any dread or reality of a three months' imprisonment.

Now I must say, that in dealing with crime I have one principal desire,—I care not to punish, I care less to revenge, neither do I care for “upholding the majesty of the law,” for if the law be good it will uphold its own majesty; and if it be not good, I do not care to uphold it—but I do care *to stop crime*, to stop the old criminal from continuing it—far more to stop others from commencing.

Now I have found in a pretty long experience with two classes, viz., poachers and juvenile thieves, that no threat of punishment, and no punishment itself, excepting for the exact time (all too brief) while they are in durance, will have anything like the deterrent effect of a simple knowledge that they and their doings are known and systematically registered. It is, too, of the utmost importance that when we have to do battle with an enemy, we should, as early as may be in the campaign, acquire some definite notion as to the force we are to cope with. An absurd panic is as likely to be caused by a *fancy* that the enemy may be ten times his real strength, as a defeat may be by under estimating his power.

Attention has long been given to this subject, and it is curious

Rutland, Huntingdon, and Cornwall, are too small to allow us to draw conclusions from them.

Perhaps the least explicable variations are those of Middlesex and Surrey. The former has sent to reformatories only 11·8, and the latter 7·2 per cent. on the crime of 1856, yet the former has decreased its crime by 36·7, and the latter by 46·7 per cent. Whether this will be held to counterbalance the evidence of the other counties I know not, I can only rejoice at its decrease.

to see with what results. In 1796, Mr. Colquhoun, who was considered the best authority of his day, estimates the number of persons living wholly or partially by crime in the metropolis (London being then far smaller than now) at 115,000. In 1857, only three years ago, Mr. Thompson, of Banchory, a writer highly esteemed for his research, and considered to be moderate in his calculations, at p. 152, estimates "the number of criminals in London at 28,000;" adding, "It is stated that 16,000 criminals are known to the police to be at all times engaged in their evil pursuits in London. A large number are unknown to them." At p. 154 he gives his reasons for supposing that "the number of actual criminals in England and Scotland is about 105,000; this represents the number which we at present allow to *support themselves at the public cost* either in prison or out of it."

Now here is a great difference between Mr. Colquhoun and Mr. Thompson, while the population of London has so vastly increased, crime appears to have diminished; yet Mr. Thompson, with far greater advantages of police, is more likely to be correct than Mr. Colquhoun. But two years later comes Mr. Redgrave, with very far better means of forming an estimate than either, and what estimate does he give? Why, that Middlesex, instead of 115,000 or 28,000, possesses within the Metropolitan Police District (*i.e.* including the most populous parts of Surrey, Essex, and Kent), 3,121 thieves. The number of actual criminals throughout England which Mr. Thompson put at 100,994, is found to be 40,030.

Here is indeed a cheering reduction, but I believe that a closer examination would reduce it still more.

What is meant by "known thieves and depredators," is not, so far as I know, *anywhere defined*. Nor do the police in the different parts of England attach the same meaning to the term. In Yorkshire, and generally throughout the North of England, they profess to return no one as a known thief "who is ever known to do any honest work." In the south, with the exception of large towns, every man is entered as a "known thief, who has ever been known to steal." The difference of course is enormous, and explains the extraordinary variation found in the succeeding column which gives the number of persons in each county in proportion to each thief.

When we find that Berks, Bucks, Nottinghamshire, and Leicester return more than one known thief for every 200 of the population, while Derbyshire, East and North York, return only 1 to 800, and West York 1 to 1,235; when we find Birmingham return 1 to 134, Bristol 1 to 712, Manchester and Salford 1 to 498, Liverpool 1 to 1,155, we cannot but feel that only a different estimate of the term "known thief" can account for such discrepancies.

But if we look still farther, and find that Birmingham with only

134 honest men to 1 thief, has 246 population for each committal; while Liverpool with only 1 thief in every 1,155, has one committal for every 55 persons; we may feel sure that valuable as the attempt is, it has not yet attained a true result.

Yet I know that in my own county, and I believe throughout England, there can hardly exist one habitual thief in 100 whose habits, as well as habitat, are not pretty well known to the police. Indeed, of all the men and boys I have known who usually earned one quarter of their subsistence by theft, I have rarely found their liberty between imprisonments average above six months, a proof that they are pretty well known: (receivers, indeed, will often go on for many years without being caught, but I am speaking now of the thieves apart from the receivers). Whence then, if police are thus skilful and honest, arises such a discrepancy? Solely, I believe, from the different interpretations assigned to the general term "known thief." In Yorkshire, I am informed, no man is thus returned who is ever known to do honest work, and thus out of a population of 1,174,000, the known thieves are 951. In Gloucestershire, with equally perfect knowledge of the individual thieves, they returned every man as a thief whom they knew had ever stolen anything; and out of a population of under 400,000, returned 777 known thieves. Had they adopted the Yorkshire definition, they certainly would not have found 77 in the county.

I would then earnestly call on magistrates and police, as well as on those who collect the statistics, to try whether some expedient may not be found for obtaining this information more correctly. I believe it to be the very knowledge upon which must be based all systematic endeavours for the repression of crime. How then can it be obtained?

It appears to me that it would not be very difficult to make a certain gradation of fictitious cases, in such a way that every superintendent of police may know nearly, if not exactly, whereabouts in the scale each case may be placed. I have added a rough sketch of such a table (Table G.), not with a view to its exact adoption, but simply to throw out an idea upon which the police of various counties may improve. A line may then be drawn by the Statist of the Home Office, I care not whether between *a* and *b* or between *i* and *k* which will be similarly intelligible over all England, and it would tell the Statist, the Magistrate, and the Legislator, what was the real amount of crime of a certain standing in each locality, and in such a way as to enable them to make provision for reducing the numbers at large. Even if two divisions could be drawn and called *Dishonest* and *Thieves*, it would make the matter far more clear. For example, *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *h*, in the supposed scale might be classed as *dishonest*, that is, frequently yielding to temptation, but not deriving any

material part of their income from dishonest sources; while the divisions *i*, *k*, *l*, are returned as *known thieves*;—or, according to the views of the police in some parts of England, even *l* would be only set down as dishonest, because he only derives half his income from stealing; and the term “known thief” would apply only to such as live *solely* by thieving. But no matter where the line is drawn, if it be only drawn *alike* in all places, and if the Statist and Legislator know really somewhere about what idea to attach to the numbers given.

If we have to wage war against an enemy, a copy of his muster-roll is invaluable, but if we have only the number of persons given, and do not know whether these are all trained, organized soldiers, or whether nine-tenths of them are mere camp followers, our information will be of little avail. But if Magistrate, Statist, and Legislator can join first to procure accurate information and then act upon it, I feel no doubt that the whole crime of England will be found to be far lower than has ever been supposed; and that we have, with no new expense, and next to no new laws, the means of reducing it to a degree far lower than has yet been contemplated.

---

INDEX TO CONTENTS OF THE FOLLOWING TABLE (F).

---

I.			IV.		
	Col.			Col.	
A	1	Names of <i>counties</i> in alphabetical order.	G	22—25	<i>Girls</i> committed to prisons (“Jud. Stat.,” table 2 of Prisons).
B	2	Imperial <i>acreage</i> , from the Census, 1851 (p. 169 of “Summary Tables”).	H	26—31	Rev. S. Turner’s table, ( <i>vide</i> his “Report,” 1859, p. 72).
II.			V.		
C	3—8	Total <i>prisoners</i> of all ages committed or bailed for trial (“Judicial “Statistics,” 1856, p. 73; 1857, p. 82; 1858, p. 102; 1859, p. 53).	I	32	Population of <i>police district</i> (“Jud. Stat.,” table 1 of Police).
D	9—12	Total <i>offenders</i> sentenced to gaols by courts and magistrates (“Jud. Stat.,” table 2 of Prisons).	K	33—35	Numbers and <i>cost of police</i> (“Jud. Stat.,” table 1 of Prisons).
III.			VI.		
E	13—16	Daily average of <i>sentenced prisoners</i> in gaols (“Jud. Stat.,” table 5 of Prisons).	L	36, 37	“Known thieves” (Jud. Stat.,” table 2 of Police).
F	17—20	<i>Boys</i> committed to prisons (“Jud. Stat.,” table 2 of Prisons).	M	38	Population (1851) to one “known thief” in 1859, <i>calculated</i> .
	21	Names of counties repeated.	N	39, 40	Prostitutes, 1858-9 (“Jud. Stat.,” table 2 of Police).

*Counties of England and Wales—Summary of the following Table (F.)—Abstract of Criminal Returns, 1854-9.*

ENGLAND.

Years.	C. Total Prisoners of all Ages Committed or Bailed for Trial.	D. Total Offenders Sentenced to Gaols by Courts and Magistrates.	E. Daily Average of Sentenced Prisoners in Gaols.	F. Boys Committed to Prisons.	G. Girls Committed to Prisons.	H. Total Boys sent to Reformatories, 1856-9.	K. Police : Number of Men.	L. “Known Thieves.”	N. Prostitutes.
1854.....	No 28,494	No. not given	No. not given	No. not givn.	No. not givn.	No. —	No. not givn.	No. not givn.	No. not givn.
'55.....	24,985	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
'56.....	18,784	110,906	17,279	11,652	2,198	1,286	—	—	—
'57.....	19,530	121,394	18,568	10,626	1,567	total of	—	—	—
'58.....	17,141	114,706	18,217	8,686	1,399	the four	19,976	37,713	27,564
'59.....	15,924	103,733	16,465	7,454	1,260	years	—	37,115	29,530
<i>Average</i>	20,810	112,685	17,632	9,604	1,606	—	—	—	—

WALES.

	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
1854.....	865	not given	not given	not givn.	not givn.	not given	not givn.	not givn.	not givn.
'55.....	987	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
'56.....	653	2,830	490	156	110	35	—	—	—
'57.....	739	3,429	549	196	102	total of	—	—	—
'58.....	714	3,458	538	151	93	the four	621	2,319	1,196
'59.....	750	3,439	537	128	70	years	—	2,423	1,250
<i>Average</i>	784	3,289	529	158	94	—	—	—	—

(F.)—Counties of England and Wales.—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A.	B.	C.						D.	
Counties of England and Wales. (L.)	Imperial Acreage.	Total Prisoners of all ages Committed or Bailed FOR TRIAL.						Total Offenders by Courts	
		1854.	'55.	'56.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Beds .....	295,582	211	224	138	115	80	92	583	533
Berks ..	451,040	363	293	189	193	185	135	797	919
Bucks .....	466,932	273	280	196	153	152	100	632	671
Cambridge ....	523,861	279	225	136	174	129	117	698	759
Chester .....	787,078	1,092	882	870	904	615	578	2,867	2,811
Cornwall .....	873,600	269	252	163	200	167	172	575	678
Cumberland...	1,001,273	152	122	87	95	82	66	433	369
Derby .....	658,803	286	317	268	235	201	189	1,012	1,083
Devon .....	1,657,180	838	667	532	546	481	417	2,451	2,319
Dorset .....	632,025	368	259	171	144	137	121	632	626
Durham .....	622,476	352	428	314	316	257	273	2,246	2,477
Essex .....	1,060,549	674	529	369	344	274	263	1,692	1,914
Gloucester ....	775,627	969	922	607	578	500	454	1,567	1,458
Bristol .....	31,315							1,348	1,592
Hereford .....	534,823	257	192	114	118	94	88	457	567
Herts .....	391,141	387	350	169	190	136	133	883	980
Huntingdon....	230,865	106	69	37	44	38	35	267	267
Kent .....	1,041,479	1,112	999	713	787	774	729	3,904	4,330
Lancaster .....	1,148,976	3,454	3,151	2,958	3,590	3,341	3,003	3,760	4,167
Liverpool .....	52,789							8,918	9,525
Manchester and Salford	17,458							6,707	7,313
Leicester .....	514,164	343	321	185	252	210	158	977	1,113
Lincoln .....	1,776,738	457	376	282	345	320	300	1,218	1,664
Middlesex ....	180,168	4,194	3,254	2,804	2,675	2,252	2,432	26,434	29,125

*Abstract of Criminal Returns, &c., 1854-59.*

11 12		13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
sentenced to Gaols and Magistrates.		E. Daily Average of Sentenced Prisoners in Gaols.				F. Boys Committed to Prisons.			
'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.
No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
453	374	98	100	122	80	46	42	25	28
842	655	176	153	148	133	68	62	62	45
644	600	117	130	118	96	46	38	40	42
690	676	124	132	122	104	52	62	35	46
2,458	2,171	510	548	465	404	242	179	149	117
761	679	123	125	133	129	31	40	29	16
431	421	82	75	79	89	44	22	41	23
1,095	1,000	234	258	244	215	79	69	49	39
2,128	2,189	329	338	312	304	202	188	153	159
604	572	136	122	107	99	52	47	38	22
2,737	2,590	335	367	390	377	73	213	158	137
1,919	1,618	253	304	281	239	175	163	128	86
1,396	1,287	258	266	255	236	183	122	110	130
1,373	1,487	182	225	204	172	199	175	116	129
505	524	65	83	71	59	18	18	14	25
952	796	146	159	158	132	94	58	65	49
270	165	39	44	44	31	11	9	23	9
3,800	3,461	650	716	691	695	285	279	225	236
4,145	3,884	961	887	972	843	279	210	217	228
7,350	7,858	832	1,086	1,102	931	708	502	387	404
7,208	6,395	1,132	1,163	1,165	987	751	827	622	401
1,082	906	262	298	297	256	84	110	139	89
1,839	1,723	228	271	302	284	63	89	77	77
27,403	23,469	3,210	3,445	3,270	3,010	3,606	3,138	2,644	2,281



## (F.)—Counties of England and Wales.—

21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
Counties of England and Wales, (II.)	G.				H.						
	Girls Committed to Prisons.				Rev. S. Turner's Table.						
	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	Boys Con- victed, 1856.	Boys Sent to Reformatories, 1856-9.		Boys Con- victed, 1859.	Boys' Convictions <i>Reduced in</i> 1859 compared with 1856.		
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Pr. ct.	No.	No.	Pr. ct.	
Beds.....	2	3	5	4	46	28	60·8	28	18	39·1	
Berks .....	18	14	7	12	68	38	55·8	45	23	33·8	
Bucks .....	5	4	2	2	46	5	10·8	42	4	8·6	
Cambridge ....	5	8	4	5	52	9	17·3	46	6	11·5	
Chester .....	47	31	18	20	242	85	35·1	117	125	51·6	
Cornwall .....	12	3	12	13	31	—	—	16	15	48·3	
Cumberland....	9	11	5	6	44	19	43·1	23	21	47·7	
Derby .....	10	12	4	23	79	20	25·3	39	40	50·6	
Devon .....	34	36	35	22	202	51	25·2	159	43	21·2	
Dorset .....	8	7	12	6	52	23	44·2	22	30	55·5	
Durham .....	20	37	39	39	73	73	100·	137	increase		
Essex .....	17	18	15	12	175	35	20·	86	89	50·8	
Gloucester ...	41	19	7	19	382	163	42·6	259	123	32·1	
Bristol.....	20	29	18	12							
Hereford .....	5	7	4	3	18	9	50·	25	increase		
Herts .....	12	4	6	1	94	17	18·	49	45	47·8	
Huntingdon....	4	5	6	1	11	1	9·	9	2	18·1	
Kent.....	53	50	34	40	285	41	14·3	236	49	17·1	
Lancaster .....	63	23	30	29	1,738	694	39·9	1,033	705	40·8	
Liverpool.....	285	152	99	87							
Manchester } and Salford }	82	101	73	55							
Leicester .....	16	16	18	11	84	36	42·8	89	increase		
Lincoln .....	25	20	39	25	63	16	23·6	75	increase		
Middlesex ....	642	398	368	278	3,606	429	11·8	2,281	1,325	36·74	

*Abstract of Criminal Returns, &c., 1854-59.—Contd.*

32 I.	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
County Population, 1851.	K. County and Borough Police, 1858.			L. "Known Thieves."		M. Population (1851), to one known Thief (1859).	N. Prostitutes.	
	Men.	Cost.		1858.	'59.		1858.	'59.
		Total.	Pr. Man.					
Persons. 124,478	No. 83	£ 6,454	£ 77	No. 603	No. 601	One in 207	No. 89	No. 90
170,828	178	16,845	95	967	1,026	166	380	388
163,862	127	9,961	78	714	872	187	144	134
184,630	167	12,486	75	737	651	283	239	219
450,407	341	29,556	86	733	765	588	264	285
351,499	246	15,447	63	352	344	1,021	231	234
195,492	119	8,168	68	217	220	888	75	85
302,621	210	16,231	80	372	357	847	238	324
590,006	469	28,283	60	487	525	1,123	1,212	1,413
184,870	163	11,260	68	634	723	255	400	372
390,094	344	23,622	86	522	533	731	353	392
312,786	270	20,312	75	1,209	1,149	272	616	609
339,491	294	17,401	60	750	777	436	260	301
138,225	303	17,800	59	258	194	712	446	276
116,127	90	6,258	70	254	228	509	109	105
151,071	165	9,197	87	637	641	235	202	207
64,460	48	4,559	96	164	122	528	96	60
465,737	397	28,187	71	913	1,062	438	821	1,047
1,281,191	1,032	77,362	75	2,217	2,271	605	896	797
374,401	982	63,127	64	382	324	1,155	2,579	2,583
390,905	604	35,048	58	356	608	498	847	1,123
230,366	159	11,507	72	1,696	1,298	179	159	194
407,649	338	23,031	68	796	931	437	645	605
2,545,650	6,904	53,074	77	3,121	2,765	894	7,194	6,849

## (F.)—Counties of England and Wales.—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A.	B.	C.						D.	
Counties of England and Wales, (I.)	Imperial Acreage.	Total Prisoners of all ages Committed or Bailed FOR TRIAL.						Total Offenders by Courts	
		1854.	'55.	'56.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Monmouth ....	368,399	424	338	179	225	192	174	811	873
Norfolk .....	1,354,301	735	636	355	371	341	331	1,720	1,801
Northampton	630,358	294	295	191	182	119	162	883	937
Northumber- land .....	1,249,299	356	420	195	198	172	158	2,332	2,849
Notts .....	526,076	401	431	231	246	216	214	1,222	1,599
Oxon .....	472,887	313	276	194	129	140	107	840	830
Rutland .....	95,805	27	16	15	8	11	19	64	75
Salop .....	826,055	286	272	243	175	189	149	958	830
Somerset .....	1,047,220	716	585	389	382	355	281	1,536	1,646
Southampton	1,070,216	722	783	520	536	450	454	2,438	2,812
Stafford .....	728,468	1,137	1,030	717	625	585	569	3,685	3,785
Suffolk .....	947,681	578	403	262	275	228	191	1,117	1,329
Surrey .....	478,792	1,236	984	780	882	649	674	7,696	8,344
Sussex, <i>East</i> <i>and West</i> ....	934,851	557	462	308	299	330	271	1,298	1,586
Warwick .....	561,286	956	883	753	761	640	600	1,293	1,193
<i>Birmingham</i>	7,831							1,701	1,948
Westmoreland	485,432	59	33	13	27	22	25	255	231
Wilts .....	865,092	377	354	188	165	174	119	942	987
Worcester ....	469,620	595	673	405	419	388	302	1,478	1,505
York, West....	1,705,926	—	—	—	—	—	—	3,705	4,400
<i>Leeds</i> .....	2,100	2,089	1,999	1,544	1,627	1,515	1,296	1,245	1,603
East & North	2,121,260	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,628	2,978
Totals for England }	32,674,897	28,494	24,985	18,784	19,530	17,141	15,924	110,906	121,394

*Abstract of Criminal Returns, &c., 1854-59—Contd.*

11 12		13 14 15 16				17 18 19 20			
sentenced to Gaols and Magistrates.		E. Daily Average of Sentenced Prisoners in Gaols.				F. Boys Committed to Prisons.			
'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.
No. 822	No. 784	No. 128	No. 148	No. 148	No. 133	No. 42	No. 35	No. 42	No. 21
1,669	1,647	232	268	260	255	187	188	147	116
883	904	241	193	222	191	79	63	64	67
3,055	2,355	313	274	280	248	220	162	188	150
1,352	1,308	223	254	216	219	119	134	132	88
778	658	123	131	128	103	44	43	53	23
63	64	9	9	9	7	4	4	2	1
1,072	974	131	129	149	120	67	28	31	46
1,531	1,458	275	264	255	211	171	142	100	132
2,582	2,427	409	450	423	402	239	255	189	144
3,772	3,587	622	655	676	901	209	222	189	179
1,306	1,152	205	209	188	193	123	104	79	78
7,504	6,247	1,012	1,209	1,136	953	1,317	1,437	968	701
1,487	1,387	273	284	279	265	150	146	94	107
1,219	1,155	265	282	266	248	91	65	78	80
1,554	1,417	359	359	367	313	265	244	143	119
249	218	23	33	26	25	12	12	9	8
863	722	169	180	163	121	37	56	47	59
1,487	1,363	264	286	277	225	80	61	75	74
4,386	3,631	689	821	822	635	372	226	219	154
1,844	1,783	219	252	255	238	129	98	79	103
3,143	2,892	613	583	620	554	295	244	212	186
114,706	103,733	17,279	18,568	18,217	16,465	11,652	10,626	8,686	7,454

## (F.)—Counties of England and Wales.—

21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Counties of England and Wales, (II.)	G.				H.					
	Girls Committed to Prisons.				Rev. S. Turner's Table,					
	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	Boys Con- victed, 1856.	Boys Sent to Reformatories, 1856-9.		Boys Con- victed, 1859.	Boys' Convictions Reduced in 1859 compared with 1856.	
	No. 34	No. 13	No. 14	No. 10	No. 42	No. 7	Pr. ct. 16·6	No. 21	No. 21	Pr. ct. 50·
Monmouth ....										
Norfolk .....	15	15	11	8	187	107	57·2	116	71	37·9
Northampton	10	9	9	8	79	14	17·9	67	12	15·
Northumber- land .....	79	36	33	46	220	129	56·6	150	70	31·8
Notts .....	17	23	17	13	119	24	20·1	88	31	26·
Oxon .....	7	7	6	5	44	9	20·4	23	21	47·7
Rutland .....	—	—	1	—	4	—	—	1	3	75·
Salop .....	20	17	12	8	67	13	19·3	46	21	31·3
Somerset .....	35	36	28	15	171	45	26·3	132	39	22·1
Southampton	42	23	27	31	239	51	21·3	144	85	35·5
Stafford .....	77	22	26	37	209	47	22·4	179	30	14·8
Suffolk .....	15	7	21	11	123	44	35·7	78	45	36·5
Surrey .....	161	144	117	143	1,317	95	7·2	701	616	46·7
Sussex. <i>East</i> } <i>and West....</i> }	31	38	23	26	150	36	24·	107	43	28·6
Warwick .....	14	7	11	18	356	223	62·6	199	157	44·1
Birmingham	49	38	17	21						
Westmoreland	8	1	3	5	12	5	41·6	8	4	33·3
Wilts .....	9	12	7	15	37	32	86·4	59	increase	
Worcester ...	29	22	27	18	80	62	77·5	74	6	7·5
York, West ...	58	35	52	39						
Leeds .....	15	24	36	24	796	343	43·	443	353	44·3
East & North	38	35	41	33						
Totals for } England }	2,198	1,567	1,399	1,260	4,252	1,286	30·2	2,577	1,628	—

## Abstract of Criminal Returns, &amp;c., 1854-59.—Contd.

32 I.  County Population, 1851.	33 K. County and Borough Police, 1858.			36 L. " Known Thieves."		38 M. Population (1851), to one known Thief (1859).	39 N. Prostitutes.	
	Men.	Cost.		1858.	'59.		1858.	'59.
		Total.	Pr. Mau.					
	No.	£	£	No.	No.	One in 413	No.	No.
Persons. 158,028	121	8,374	69	390	382		401	311
440,506	364	26,917	74	1,791	1,877	234	761	1,038
212,159	147	11,575	72	332	424	500	91	99
304,474	277	20,546	74	348	312	975	509	441
269,808	207	14,006	69	1,475	1,438	187	330	307
170,269	141	7,802	55	258	434	392	166	94
24,272	5	603	120	117	121	200	41	41
229,325	130	7,599	58	700	646	354	160	176
424,539	378	24,179	64	948	1,248	340	396	588
405,727	409	30,672	75	1,989	1,825	222	1,800	3,040
629,365	503	34,993	69	2,044	1,624	387	703	671
358,184	239	17,648	76	875	819	437	436	358
117,664	132	9,283	70	232	265	444	108	114
338,639	304	23,953	79	884	796	425	444	492
248,921	229	14,543	63	477	417	597	210	191
232,841	366	24,892	68	1,885	1,732	134	324	250
59,741	31	2,429	80	28	63	948	10	6
254,221	213	14,928	70	948	1,004	253	202	187
274,748	217	14,682	70	1,179	856	320	312	363
1,174,585	966	63,618	65	920	951	1,235	768	1,007
172,270	221	14,175	68	212	220	783	188	192
476,610	403	29,873	74	516	589	809	870	872
16,903,742	19,976	1,442,266	72	37,713	37,115	455	27,564	29,530

## (F.)—Counties of England and Wales.—

1 A.	2 B.	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Counties of England and Wales, (I.)	Imperial Acreage.	C. Total Prisoners of all ages Committed or Bailed FOR TRIAL.						D. Total Offenders by Courts	
		1854.	'55.	'56.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.
		No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
<b>WALES.</b>	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Anglesey .....	193,453	27	31	24	37	16	18	82	80
Brecon .....	460,158	51	71	48	28	33	41	142	113
Cardigan .....	443,387	15	17	16	10	21	15	171	246
Carmarthen ....	606,331	47	48	35	40	37	17	185	162
Carnarvon ....	370,273	59	58	33	40	44	37	120	148
Denbigh .....	386,052	87	78	48	62	51	51	233	250
Flint.....	184,905	50	37	33	32	33	44	120	132
Glamorgan ....	547,494	335	475	280	334	366	397	1,362	1,743
Merioneth ....	385,291	23	24	12	10	12	11	21	38
Montgomery	483,323	81	76	56	68	55	48	151	221
Pembroke ....	401,691	68	60	54	65	33	49	174	230
Radnor.....	272,128	22	12	14	13	13	22	69	66
North Wales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
South Wales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals for Wales....}	4,734,486	865	987	653	739	714	750	2,830	3,429
Totals for England }	32,674,897	28,494	24,985	18,784	19,530	17,141	15,924	110,906	121,394
England and Wales .... }	37,409,383	29,359	25,972	19,437	20,269	17,855	16,674	113,736	124,823

*Abstract of Criminal Returns, &c., 1854-59—Contd.*

11 12		13 14 15 16				17 18 19 20			
sentenced to Gaols and Magistrates.		E. Daily Average of Sentenced Prisoners in Gaols.				F. Boys Committed to Prisons.			
'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.
No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
118	82	14	18	20	12	—	5	5	—
129	149	28	28	23	24	1	2	4	9
52	64	11	12	12	14	12	11	2	2
174	154	33	37	35	35	3	4	3	5
171	196	29	31	34	31	2	2	2	1
235	217	34	36	34	36	12	10	7	2
179	147	17	18	25	22	8	3	2	4
1,806	1,850	234	266	247	267	92	132	114	95
84	63	7	9	11	10	—	—	1	4
213	184	28	35	41	29	5	8	3	2
216	269	44	45	40	40	17	16	6	4
81	64	11	14	16	17	4	3	2	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
3,458	3,439	490	549	538	537	156	196	151	128
114,706	103,733	17,279	18,568	18,217	16,465	11,652	10,626	8,686	7,454
118,164	107,172	17,769	19,117	18,755	17,002	11,808	10,822	8,837	7,582



(F.)—*Counties of England and Wales.*—

21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Counties of England and Wales, (II.)	G.				H.					
	Girls Committed to Prisons.				Rev. S. Turner's Table.					
	1856.	'57.	'58.	'59.	Boys Con- victed, 1856.	Boys Sent to Reformatories, 1856-9.		Boys Con- victed, 1859.	Boys' Convictions <i>Reduced</i> in 1859 compared with 1856.	
WALES.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	Pr. ct.	No.	No.	Pr. ct.
Anglesey .....	2	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Brecon .....	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Cardigan .....	6	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carmarthen ....	4	4	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Carnarvon ....	5	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Denbigh .....	2	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Flint .....	—	3	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Glamorgan ....	90	86	77	63	—	—	—	—	—	—
Merioneth ....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Montgomery ..	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pembroke ....	1	1	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Radnor .....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
North Wales	—	—	—	—	27	3	11'1	9	18	66'6
South Wales	—	—	—	—	125	32	25'6	101	24	19'
Totals for } Wales....	110	102	93	70	—	—	—	—	—	—
Totals for } England	2,198	1,567	1,399	1,260	—	—	—	—	—	—
England and } Wales ....	2,308	1,669	1,492	1,330	—	—	—	—	—	—

*Abstract of Criminal Returns, &c., 1854-59—Contd.*

32 I.	33 K.	34	35	36 L.	37	38 M.	39 N.	40
County Population, 1851.	County and Borough Police, 1858.			"Known Thieves."		Population (1851), to one known Thief (1859.)	Prostitutes.	
	Men.	Cost.		1858.	'59.		1858.	'59.
		Total.	Pr. Man.					
Persons.	No.	£	£	No.	No.	One in	No.	No.
57,193	20	1,857	93	66	74	773	15	17
61,278	34	2,367	70	9	8	7,659	19	21
70,756	31	2,187	70	41	42	1,684	10	11
110,819	62	4,270	69	149	161	743	19	33
97,383	40	2,900	72	64	84	1,521	36	57
92,583	53	3,760	71	60	46	1,543	46	15
68,082	45	2,590	57	20	11	3,404	—	2
250,863	222	14,793	67	1,604	1,659	151	940	916
38,880	19	1,395	73	22	22	1,767	—	—
67,335	29	2,265	75	118	129	524	57	59
95,190	51	2,935	57	146	180	528	51	113
24,648	15	1,216	80	20	7	3,521	3	6
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1,035,010	621	42,535	67	2,319	2,423	427	1,196	1,250
16,903,742	19,976	1,442,266	72	37,713	37,115	455	27,564	29,530
17,938,752	20,597	1,484,801	72	40,032	39,538	453	28,760	30,780

(G.)—*Suggested Scale of Classification intended to Simplify and render Uniform the Police Designations of Dishonest and Criminal Characters.*

(I.)—COUNTRY LABOURERS.

- a. A labourer ; was convicted 2 years ago of stealing some old hurdles from his master for fire-wood. Hitherto supposed to be of good character, but probably has been in the habit of doing the same before.
- b. Labourer ; 2 years ago stole a hatchet from his master, and sold it. Three months' imprisonment. Since then working steadily.
- c. Labourer ; stole a coat and a pair of boots one year ago from a neighbour's garden. Three months' imprisonment. Since then in regular work, but given to drink, and not well thought of.
- d. Labourer ; convicted 2 years ago (one month), and again, 8 months since, (3 months' imprisonment). In regular work, but appears not to live more expensively than his wages warrant.
- e. Three times convicted in 10 years,—1 month, 3 months, 1 month. Not well thought of, but we cannot say that he seems to spend more than his wages warrant.
- f. Four times convicted in 5 years, and often suspected of having stolen other things ; all however, were things lying in his way, and he seems not to be able to resist temptation ; he is in nearly constant work when out of prison ; earns about 10s. a-week, and his wife and one child about 3s. more ; lives much as others do who earn similar wages.
- g. Three times convicted in 5 years, and often suspected, but two of the offences were going out at night to steal coal from one and potatoes from another of his neighbours, has been frequently suspected of such thefts ; still he earns 11s. a-week and his wife 2s., and we cannot see that he lives beyond it.
- h. Four times convicted in 10 years, twice breaking into a cottage in the day time and stealing to the value of 3*l.* from one, and 1*l.* from the other, generally suspected ; frequently out of work, perhaps altogether 3 months in the year. Lives very poorly generally but sometimes is drunk for three or four days together when out of work, and then seems very poor again.
- i. Twice convicted in 5 years, both times entering a cottage in day time while the people were out ; generally suspected ; works about one half his time, Lives sometimes very poorly, sometimes spending money freely. We can't see that he can earn so much as he spends ; probably his earnings, 10s. a-week when in work, would make two-thirds of his spending.
- k. Only once convicted 4 years ago, but is generally thought ill of. Works only half his time ; and at times appears to have plenty of money. There have been many complaints in the neighbourhood of fowls lost, gardens robbed, &c., but none have been detected ; he appears to spend about twice as much as he earns.
- l. Four times convicted in 10 years. Single man, frequently absent from the parish for a month or more. Works not above a quarter of his time while he is here. Should say, he spends three times as much as he earns.

## (II.)—TOWN LABOURERS.

- a.* Journeyman gunmaker ; convicted 3 years ago. Since working for the same master without suspicion.
- b.* Porter ; twice convicted in the last 3 years, but of very small offences ; still working with the same master, does not appear to spend more than others who have similar wages.
- c.* Shopman ; twice convicted ; given to drink. Does not appear to spend more than he earns.
- f.* Wood-Turner ; four times convicted in 5 years ; bears a bad character, but does not appear to go out of his way to steal, but cannot be trusted in any temptation. Earns 15s. a-week, can't say he seems to spend more.
- g.* Four times convicted ; twice for stealing vegetables at a night from a garden outside the town, where he had no business to go ; but he is in constant work, and we cannot say he spends more than his wages.
- h.* Three times convicted in 5 years ; generally distrusted ; lives very poorly ; is out of work about two months in the year ; now and then drinks freely for three or four days, but generally seems poor.
- i.* Twice convicted ; seldom keeps a place long ; is half his time out of work ; lives poorly, but often drinks. We should say spends twice as much as he earns.
- k.* Only once convicted ; 3 years ago ; a clever workman but always distrusted, and half his time idle ; but always seems to have plenty of money. We don't see how he can earn half of what he appears to spend. Is occasionally found drinking with L, and others of the same class.
- l.* Pretends to be a joiner, but seldom appears to work at his trade ; generally has plenty of money. Twice convicted in company with X, Y, and Z, known thieves.

## POACHING.

- a.* Convicted 3 years ago of wiring a hare in his neighbour's hedge, not since suspected. Regular work.
- c.* Twice convicted of wiring hares ; one in a covert a mile from his house. Is in regular work and not generally of a bad character.
- f.* Four times convicted of wiring hares and rabbits in different coverts, but in regular work and does not appear to spend much, if any more, than his wages.
- g.* Three times convicted, and frequently seen watching coverts, but is in regular work, earns a-week, and does not appear to spend more.
- h.* Four times convicted ; works steadily in summer but not above half his time in winter ; frequently drunk, but lives generally very poorly.
- i.* Twice caught trespassing in pursuit of game ; works regularly in summer, but little in winter. Lives better and drinks more in winter than summer. Probably in winter two-thirds of his living is by poaching.

- k.* Keeps a low public-house with little custom except poachers. Frequently has large numbers of live pheasants in a loft. *K* occasionally goes from home for three months together with *L*, *M*, and *N*. Appears to have three times as much money as his beer-shop will account for.

Boys.

- a.* Lives with his father : once convicted 3 years ago of stealing six turnips.
- b.* At home ; 2 years ago stole a knife from another boy.
- f.* Three times convicted in 4 years ; and thought generally dishonest but has only been known to take things that lay in his way ; not going out at night or getting other boys to help him. Lives entirely at home, where he has enough to eat.
- g.* Three times convicted in 5 years, often suspected ; lives at home, but is very idle, and often in company with a bad lot of idle boys.
- i.* Three times convicted of regular shop-lifting, in company with other boys. Lives at home, but steals to get small luxuries, porter, cakes, &c.
- l.* Absconded from home, and has lived two years in (Lisson Grove, White-chapel, &c., London ; St. John's Market, Liverpool, &c.,) occasionally holding a horse, or carrying a parcel from a railroad, but mainly as a pick-pocket, shoplifter, parlour jumper, damper drawer, or the like.

*Note.*—The above is a merely fictitious set of cases, but if the Statist would send such a list to each chief of police and say, “I wish you to enter as known thieves all such cases as *h* and those below, but not such cases as *g* and those “above ;” the Yorkshire police would enter far more, the Gloucestershire far less, and gentlemen who write in the newspapers, would not maintain that “every one who is entered as a known thief gets *his whole living* by theft.”

If he were to say “I wish you to class *d*, *e*, *f*, *g*, *h*, as *dishonest*, *i.e.*, people “who yield to temptation when temptation lies in their way ; and class *i*, *k*, *l*, as “known thieves, because they systematically form schemes for theft ;”—such a plan would give still further information.

I have left it purposely uncertain *where* the line should be drawn ; only let the Statist draw it in the same place for all counties, and let us know where it is drawn, and then the Statist, the Police, and the Magistrates, will understand each other.